

K-2

Kirk, Mark

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 3:40 PM
To: Csontos, Aladar; Stevens, Gary; Tregoning, Robert; Nove, Carol
Subject: RE: roles and responsibilities

Excellent ... your highlighted point was my own.

From: Csontos, Aladar
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 3:38 PM
To: Kirk, Mark; Stevens, Gary; Tregoning, Robert; Nove, Carol
Subject: RE: roles and responsibilities

Guys,

Let's not clutter up Mike's, Stu's, and Jennifer's emails. If I get 300+ per day, they get 500+ per day.

We know of the issue, we have some guidelines for Mark. Now we need to discuss these with NRR. I think Mark's plan is a good starting point for further discussions.

OK?

Thanks,
Al

From: Kirk, Mark
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 3:36 PM
To: Stevens, Gary; Csontos, Aladar; Tregoning, Robert; Nove, Carol; Richards, Stuart; Case, Michael; Uhle, Jennifer
Subject: RE: roles and responsibilities

Perhaps I restricted my paste from your "terms of reference" too much, and you lost the context. Try this:

Mission

- Share information and experience between nuclear safety authorities on regulatory approaches and actions in relation with this issue
- Taking into account the lessons learned from this issue, discuss actions to be considered in other countries
- Provide technical advice to Belgian nuclear safety authorities (FANC, Bel V, AIB Vinçotte) on specific topics / questions related to the Doel 3 & Tihange 2 RPV issue. However, the actual evaluation of potential continued operation of the Doel 3 and Tihange 2 reactors remains the responsibility of the Belgian nuclear safety authorities.

In any event, all I'm suggesting is that (with management approval, of course) it might be good to send to Mr. Rousseel a clear statement of what we can, and cannot, provide. I offer the long paragraph from Item 1 in the original e-mail as a fine starting point ... because this language has already received management approval. I think this paragraph is quite clear ... it worked very well once, so I think we should use it again.

From: Stevens, Gary
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 3:31 PM
To: Kirk, Mark; Csontos, Aladar; Tregoning, Robert; Nove, Carol; Richards, Stuart; Case, Michael; Uhle, Jennifer
Subject: RE: roles and responsibilities

B/182

The limitations seem much clearer for your participation on the Intl Expert Review Team. I do not see or feel such clarity with respect to my working group participation. Item 3 below is all that applies for the working groups, and it doesn't say anything about "NRC positions," which I have been requested to give.

Gary

From: Kirk, Mark

Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 3:24 PM

To: Stevens, Gary; Csontos, Aladar; Tregoning, Robert; Nove, Carol; Richards, Stuart; Case, Michael; Uhle, Jennifer

Subject: roles and responsibilities

Dear All –

Following on the discussion of "roles and responsibilities" we had at the meeting this morning, I wanted to provide information supporting the comment I made at the meeting that we have worked this out already, and our position is well documented and is quite clear. I believe all we need to do is remind our Belgian colleagues of what we have agreed to do, and what we cannot do. I offer for your information three pieces of information:

1. **E-mail sent to FANC authorizing my participation.** It is copied below in full, and it includes the following language:

I wish to offer the following thoughts clarifying Mark's role during his visits with you, your staff, and others while in Belgium. As requested in your e-mail, Mark will be serving as a member of your "International Expert Review Team." As part of this team it is expected that Mark will draw on his knowledge of the background of, and technical basis for, NRC regulations and practices concerning RPV integrity, as well as his knowledge concerning both deterministic and probabilistic fracture mechanics. Working together with other members of the team, Mark will assess documents prepared by the Doel licensee, and will participate in developing the team's assessment of these documents, which will be provided to FANC. It is understood that FANC will use this recommendation, along with recommendations obtained from two other groups, as the basis for its recommendations on the future operability of the Doel 3 reactor. As such, the responsibility for deciding the future operability of the Doel 3 reactor remains with FANC.

Based on this language, the FANC included sentences into their "Terms of Reference", documents as described in items 2 & 3

2. **FANC Terms of Reference for International Expert Review Team.** This document is attached for your information. It includes the following language:

The actual evaluation of potential continued operation of the Doel 3 reactor rests with the FANC and will take into account all available input, evaluations and recommendations.

3. **FANC Terms of Reference for Regulatory Expert Groups.** This document is attached for your information. It includes the following language:

The actual evaluation of potential continued operation of the Doel 3 and Tihange 2 reactors remains the responsibility of the Belgian nuclear safety authorities.

Best

mark

Mark Kirk

Senior Materials Engineer

NRC/RES/DE/CIB

mark.kirk@nrc.gov

From: Sangimino, Donna-Marie
To: Willy.deroovere@fanc.fgov.be <Willy.deroovere@fanc.fgov.be>
Cc: Kirk, Mark; Fehst, Geraldine; Eisenberg, Wendy
Sent: Fri Sep 07 16:53:06 2012
Subject: Doel 3 Reactor Vessel International Review Board

Dear Dr. De Roovere,

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Donna-Marie Sangimino; I am the head of the International Programs Team in the NRC's Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

I am responding to the e-mail request dated August 28th 2012 sent to our staff member, Mark Kirk, requesting that he participate in an international taskforce that FANC is convening to help with your assessment of the indications recently found in the Doel 3 reactor. The NRC is pleased to support your request by enabling Mark to participate in the meetings you have outlined. We thank you for your offer to reimburse Mark's travel cost, but NRC will cover all costs (including travel) associated with Mark's participation in this activity.

So that it is clear, I wish to offer the following thoughts clarifying Mark's role during his visits with you, your staff, and others while in Belgium. As requested in your e-mail, Mark will be serving as a member of your "International Expert Review Team." As part of this team it is expected that Mark will draw on his knowledge of the background of, and technical basis for, NRC regulations and practices concerning RPV integrity, as well as his knowledge concerning both deterministic and probabilistic fracture mechanics. Working together with other members of the team, Mark will assess documents prepared by the Doel licensee, and will participate in developing the team's assessment of these documents, which will be provided to FANC. It is understood that FANC will use this recommendation, along with recommendations obtained from two other groups, as the basis for its recommendations on the future operability of the Doel 3 reactor. As such, the responsibility for deciding the future operability of the Doel 3 reactor remains with FANC.

I understand that you are still establishing dates for your meetings in Brussels. Please interact with Mark directly (mark.kirk@nrc.gov) to establish suitable dates, provide read ahead material, or any other matters associated with the conduct of your meetings. Also please be advised that Mark has an upcoming trip to Korea from September 22nd to 29th, so those dates should be avoided.

Finally, I would appreciate it if you would include me on "cc" in any e-mail correspondence with Mark so that I can keep the appropriate offices within the NRC informed of these activities.

Please let me know if any additional support is needed to help facilitate this important exchange.

Best regards,

Donna-Marie Sangimino

International Programs Team Leader
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES)
Donna-Marie.Sangimino@nrc.gov
(+1) 301-251-7673